

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/749,819	Applicant(s) FUKUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Wes Tucker	Art Unit 2624	

**All Participants:**

(1) Wes Tucker.

(2) Ray Cardillo Reg. No. 40,440.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 3 November 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

7, 9 and 15

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**BHAVESH M. MEHTA**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant to correct a dependency problem, namely claim 9 depending from cancelled claim 7. Applicant also noted that claim 15 was unintentionally written to repeat itself. Applicant agreed to an Examiner's amendment to correct both of these deficiencies in the claim language..